

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/373,240	08/12/1999	GUY FOUQUET	Q055315	2369
7590 08/26/2004			EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC			LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W WASHINGTON, DC 200373213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				TATER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
* Advisory Action	09/373,240	FOUQUET ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Matthew J. Ludwig	2178				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months.	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	's Brief must be filed within the p R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	period set forth in of the appeal.				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or		erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:		•				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7.☑ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☑ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: 4,8,11 and 12.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5-7,9,10 and 13</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		the Evenine				
The drawing correction filed on is a) □ approved or b) □ disapproved by the Examiner.						
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
10. Other:		EANNER EXAMINER				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In additional support to the instant rejections, the Examiner respectfully notes that within the limitations of independent claim 1, the term formalism fails to provide an accurate description of the interpreted multimedia document. Furthermore, the Rosch reference suggests links, which create new runtime objects for the states of the slide show button and sets the position and selection-style of each created button-image object. When the run-action is activated, the image is displayed and an audio-stream is transmitted from server to client. If the user clicks onto the picture, a transition to the start page is triggered. The reference suggests the utilization of a generic event condition action along with the use of image objects. The Glass protocols define the procedures for the exchange of data between all agents that exist in the system. The Examiner believes the Glass protocols provide a suggestion of the formalisms (as presently claimed) within the event-condition-actions of the multimedia presentation system. See Rosch, page 143.